

ORIGINAL CORRESPONDENCE 4.

ON THE RESPECTIVE

TENETS OF THE TWO ORDERS OF
EPISCOPALIANS IN SCOTLAND:

RESPECTING

The Royal Supremacy ; the Canonical Obedience
due from inferior Clergy ; and the *Usages* in the
Office of the Lord's Supper, in which alone the
Worship of the Scotch Order now differs from
that of the Church of England.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

A brief historical INTRODUCTION, supported by
Citations from its Sources of Authority.

“ Concerning the Word of God, whether, by Miſconſtruction
“ of the Senſe, or by a Falſification of the Words, to at-
“ tempt knowingly that any Thing may ſeem divine which
“ is not ; or that any Thing which is may not ſo appear ;
“ were plainly to abuſe and falſify even *divine* Evidences,
“ and, though it were conſidered as an Injury offered but
“ unto *Men*, is moſt worthily counted heinous.” HOOKER.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. DIGHTON, oppoſite Gray's Inn Gate, Holbourn ;
and J. PRIDDEN, N^o 100, Fleet-ſtreet. 1794.

[Price 1s. 6d.]

ORIGINAL COPY

THE ORDER OF THE

OF THE ORDER OF THE



CONTENTS.

<i>INTRODUCTION,</i>	- - - - -	I
<i>Mr. Aitkin's first Letter,</i>	- - - - -	9
<i>The Answer,</i>	- - - - -	11
<i>Mr. Aitkin's second Letter</i>	- - - - -	13
<i>A Letter sent in October last with the former for publication in the Gentleman's Magazine; but rejected on account of its length,</i>	- - - - -	19
<i>The Appendix, containing Authorities referred to in the Introduction,</i>	- - - - -	39



INTRODUCTION.

UPON the death of Dr. Rose of Edinburgh, latest survivor of the anti-revolutional bishops, in the year 1720, the episcopal persuasion in and near that city were called together, to consult on the circumstances of their situation, and on the mode of their future regulation. It was now, for the first time, affirmed, and the assertion was proved at a second meeting, that the deceased bishop had secretly * conferred an illegal consecration on four gentlemen, for the purpose of preserving the episcopal order [1]. These four at first disclaimed, both collectively and individually, any jurisdiction over the clergy of any particular district, or regular diocese [2], in expectation, perhaps, of a regal *congé d'élire*. But very soon their hopes for the restoration of king James declined, and the royal prerogative of nomination to particular dioceses was no longer in their way; the

* It appears, that the bishop of St. David's has not been informed of the inviolable *secrecy* of those consecrations; one of his lordship's principal arguments in favour of a late act of parliament depending wholly on their supposed *notoriety* before the passing of the toleration act of 10th Anne, 1712; whereas the truth was not known till 1720, even among their own clergy. See also the Appendix, in which the authorities are severally distinguished by numbers corresponding by those in the text.

[1] Appendix I.

[2] Appendix II.

necessity of determining upon some measures for the constitution and exercise of their authority was pressed upon them, and they agreed to declare themselves a court for the administration of ecclesiastical government, as well as a college for the perpetuity of the Scottish episcopate. They also acknowledged the right of presbyters to elect their own bishop; and they directed those of Edinburgh immediately to proceed to such an election: but these having referred the matter to themselves, they thereupon nominated Bishop Foullerton, or Fullarton, the one who was absent from their *first* meeting. The authority of this college, however, and their rights, or that of the presbyters to elect bishops to particular jurisdictions, continued to be subjects of dispute till the college itself became extinct.

The *usages* in the Communion office, which are now so great an obstacle to their union, were first proposed to the Nonjurors in England by Mr. Collier and Dr. Brett in 1713; and they were readily adopted for some time by a party there. These appeared at first to be laid hold on as their test, and they were looked upon as a concession not disagreeable to the banished family, and its Popish adherents: but, in England, they were soon abandoned. In Scotland also they were privately introduced in 1717, and propagated by Mr. Gardener, an English Nonjuror, and Mr. Rattray of Craighall; but the late Bishop Rose having established the English Liturgy in 1707 [Skinner, vol. II. p. 606.], they were not *publicly* avowed during the life of that prelate. Upon their public appearance afterwards, they were severely censured and opposed by the college and its adherents [3]; but as warmly supported by Messrs. Gardener, Rattray, and others, who now disputed also the validity of the acts of the college, and de-

[3] Appendix III.

fended the rights of the presbyters to elect their own bishops; at least during the dereliction of it by the supposed king. Yet, at Aberdeen, the chief scene of Mr. Gardener's exertions, he experienced some considerable resistance; for, those, who were strictly attached to the English liturgy, actually withdrew from his meeting; and, within four years after the death of bishop Rose, they had completed, *by subscriptions*, a very large and elegant chapel, that was situated in the Gallowgate, and in which, for fear of the usages, and encouraged by an act of parliament, they settled a pastor of *English* ordination. This example was quickly followed at Montrose, and, perhaps, in other places; and the introduction of the usages was successfully opposed in many, even of the old chapels. By a large majority of the presbyters of the *district* of Aberdeen, they were admitted; by them Mr. Gardener was also quickly chosen bishop, and he obtained consecration from the hands of the Nonjurors in England; but on this account the Scotch bishops would not consent to his jurisdiction over the district, till he had acceded to an agreement, and had signed with themselves, in 1724, what was then called "The Concordate." By the conditions of this deed he obtained their consent to a *concealed* mixture of water with the sacramental wine in his own and his friends' administrations; and he, for himself and them, engaged to introduce "*none of the other ancient usages, which have not been authorized and generally received in this church.*" From a latent ambiguity in these words, Mr. Gardener conceived himself to be restricted only from the invention of *new* usages, and still adhered to all those hitherto disputed; and from that time forwards "The Concordate" ill deserved the name it had obtained. Mr. Rattray, Mr. Dunbar, Mr. Keith, and other friends of the usages, and of the presbyters' claim to the right of election, were successively chosen bishops for several districts; and being strengthened by two

other considerable deserters from the other side, with bishop Miller at their head, they at length outnumbered and over-balanced the college and its adherents. At this time the college, before the old party lost its majority, proceeded to the utmost extremities with the leaders of opposition. Mr. Miller, having been elected bishop for Edinburgh by the presbyters of the district, was summoned to appear before the college, which, upon his denial of its authority, executed against him a sentence of suspension [4], *sine die*; declared also the election of Mr. Rattray and Mr. Dunbar to be null and void, and their consecrations uncanonical and irregular; and, lastly, protested against the claim, advanced by bishop Miller, of a metropolitical authority adherent to the bishop of Edinburgh. These acts of the old college were never formally repealed; but, by those at least who were the objects of them, they were considered as indirectly cancelled by their subsequent connexions with its surviving members.

While such disputes were agitated among the Non-jurors, the friends of the reigning family were opening English chapels in all the large towns; and to their congregations many even of the Scottish communion joined, from disgust at the dissensions among their own clergy, and disapprobation of the usages: for, though in these chapels king George was always prayed for *by name*; yet those, who would not join in the prayer, contented themselves by omitting the response.

The survivors of the old college, thus weakened on all sides, were persuaded into another agreement with their opponents in 1731, which was styled "The Concordate." The consent to this was given by a majority, not the unanimity, of the college; for bishops Rois and Auchterlonie appear to have been dissen-

tient, because the right of their supposed king was re-
 linquished [5], in order to obtain an acknowledgement
 of that of surviving bishops to nominate to the vacant
 districts; which, according to the suggestion of the
 latter, must have been also the *understood* condition
 of *their* consent to the introduction of the usages, if
 by the terms of this agreement the bishops Free-
 bairn and Gillan had indeed agreed to their partial
 admission [6]. The language of this second agreement
 the reader finds to be no less indefinite and lax than
 that of the first "Concordate." Accordingly each
 party soon shewed a construction of the sense different
 from that of the others; though it is but justice to
 testify, that, in the *private* correspondence of the col-
 lege bishops with each other, which I am at this time
 reading while I write, they seem uniformly to re-
 joice with surprize at a supposed abolition of the
 usages, till the contrary sentiments of the other party
 became known. Bishop Gillan, who, in conjunction
 with bishop Freebairn, negotiated and executed the
 agreement on the part of the college, writes thus:
 " We thought it necessary to strike the iron while it was
 " hot, and resolved to sign immediately: and accord-
 " ingly we four signed all the four articles in two co-
 " pies.—You see that they have secured the public
 " worship, and have promised solemnly to censure any
 " that gives offence by propaling their practices.
 " They have given up the *Metropolitan*, and *vicar-*
 " *general*, the *power of the presbyters* in elections,
 " and will oblige themselves to *what we have en-*
 " *gaged* * in relation to bishops."—On the other
 hand, " *It is to be remembered,*" says their late historian
 Mr. Skinner, " that, *besides the points in difference be-*
 " *tween the Scotch communion office, and the present Eng-*
 " *lish book, which are the points now called the usages,*
 " there were some other authorities of ancient ob-

[5] Appendix V.

[6] Appendix VI.

 * Colvil.
 " fervance,

“ servance, such as immersion in Baptism, chrism in
 “ Confirmation, and for anointing the sick, and a
 “ few more of that kind, which bishop Collier, and
 “ his friends in England, wished to have restored;
 “ and these are the usages meant in this article, and
 “ in every article of agreement where we find the
 “ Scottish liturgy allowed, and certain antiquated
 “ usages prohibited.” But, surely, Mr. Skinner
 should remember with equal care, that “ the points
 “ now called *the usages*” were also *then* called “ *the*
 “ *usages*,” and had *ever* been so called from the time
 of their first introduction into Scotland. *Those were the*
usages enumerated particularly *, and censured, and
 resisted by the original college of bishops; and, in the
 “ agreement” called “ The first Concordate,” one of
those was specified, and “ *the others*” were referred to.
 In fact, no one had ever brought forward any of
 those secondary usages in Scotland, or, probably, had
 ever thought of doing so; at least we must acknow-
 ledge, that *they* could not have been in the minds of
 the one party; since I can assure the reader, that, in
 the private correspondence of all the college of
 bishops then surviving, the whole of which, unmeek,
 inelegant, and desultory, as it is, I have carefully
 read, I have not found this secondary set of usages
 so much as mentioned. These disputes were still con-
 tinued with great warmth; and at length the college
 became extinct by the death of bishop Auchterlonie,
 of Dundee, in 1742. The usages having been long
 abandoned by the Nonjurors in England, those in
 Scotland who retained still their attachment to the
 English liturgy, particularly those of Dundee and
 Edinburgh †, after some ineffectual remonstrances to
 the other Scotch bishops, applied to them, and had
 determined to supply the future vacancies in some of
 the Scottish chapels with pastors of their ordination.

* See Appendix III.

† Colvil.

Upon the suppression of the rebellion, however, within a year or two afterwards, a law passed, 1746, directing the loyal episcopalians to look to English or Irish bishops for future ordinations, and suppressing the Nonjurors with extreme rigour. Only three of their ministers qualified on that occasion (*I could name them*); and the rest were compelled to retire with their congregations to the closest privacy. Since that time the penal rigours have been gradually relaxed, till, in 1792, they were repealed; and the persons of that connexion, ministers and people, style themselves "The Church of Scotland," while those who do not submit to their authority, or admit the usages, are called of the communion of the Church of England, and consider themselves as such, and are served by pastors of English ordination.

THO. WATSON.

“ servance, such as immersion in Baptism, chrism in
 “ Confirmation, and for anointing the sick, and a
 “ few more of that kind, which bishop Collier, and
 “ his friends in England, wished to have restored ;
 “ and these are the usages meant in this article, and
 “ in every article of agreement where we find the
 “ Scottish liturgy allowed, and certain antiquated
 “ usages prohibited.” But, surely, Mr. Skinner
 should remember with equal care, that “ the points
 “ now called *the usages*” were also *then* called “ *the*
 “ *usages,*” and had *ever* been so called from the time
 of their first introduction into Scotland. *Those were the*
usages enumerated particularly *, and censured, and
 resisted by the original college of bishops ; and, in the
 “ agreement” called “ The first Concordate,” one of
those was specified, and “ *the others*” were referred to.
 In fact, no one had ever brought forward any of
 those secondary usages in Scotland, or, probably, had
 ever thought of doing so ; at least we must acknow-
 ledge, that *they* could not have been in the minds of
 the one party ; since I can assure the reader, that, in
 the private correspondence of all the college of
 bishops then surviving, the whole of which, unmeek,
 inelegant, and desultory, as it is, I have carefully
 read, I have not found this secondary set of usages
 so much as mentioned. These disputes were still con-
 tinued with great warmth ; and at length the college
 became extinct by the death of bishop Auchterlonie,
 of Dundee, in 1742. The usages having been long
 abandoned by the Nonjurors in England, those in
 Scotland who retained still their attachment to the
 English liturgy, particularly those of Dundee and
 Edinburgh †, after some ineffectual remonstrances to
 the other Scotch bishops, applied to them, and had
 determined to supply the future vacancies in some of
 the Scottish chapels with pastors of their ordination.

* See Appendix III.

† Colvil.

Upon the suppression of the rebellion, however, within a year or two afterwards, a law passed, 1746, directing the loyal episcopalians to look to English or Irish bishops for future ordinations, and suppressing the Nonjurors with extreme rigour. Only three of their ministers qualified on that occasion (*I could name them*); and the rest were compelled to retire with their congregations to the closest privacy. Since that time the penal rigours have been gradually relaxed, till, in 1792, they were repealed; and the persons of that connexion, ministers and people, style themselves "The Church of Scotland," while those who do not submit to their authority, or admit the usages, are called of the communion of the Church of England, and consider themselves as such, and are served by pastors of English ordination.

THO. WATSON.

ORIGINAL CORRESPONDENCE, &c.

1. *To the Reverend Mr. WATSON, Wighill, near
Tadcaster, Yorkshire.*

REV. SIR,

Aberdeen, Sept. 6, 1792.

IT is but a few days since I learnt that you are the author of the letter, in the Gentleman's Magazine for June, relative to the unhappy division which subsists between the two Episcopal communions in Scotland; otherwise I would have taken the liberty to write to you sooner.—An union of the two orders must be the wish of every friend to true religion, more especially of those who, like myself, have long been witnesses to the injury which it has received from their opposition. The perfect union which has taken place between the congregations in Banff, and promising appearance of the like desirable event elsewhere, are pleasing presages that a general coalition may probably be at no great distance.—With the view of promoting an object highly interesting to the friends of Episcopacy, I now beg leave to assure you, that I will chearfully co-operate with you in every proper measure that can tend to accomplish

B

plish

plish it; and I doubt not but the zeal you profess will produce adequate effects.—The Scotch bishops have agreed on certain articles, as terms on which they are willing to receive the clergy of the other communion into this church. These articles have been embraced at Banff, have been approved by many respectable individuals in other places, and will appear, I hope, to every candid mind so reasonable, as to be adopted by every clergyman who wishes seriously to promote the spiritual welfare of his flock. The articles are too long to be inserted in this letter verbatim; it may therefore suffice to state their substance:—“ Every clergyman, wishing to unite with any of the Scotch bishops, shall prove his ordination, by exhibiting either his original letter of orders, or a copy of them duly attested; shall declare his belief in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the word of God; shall acknowledge Jesus Christ the sole head of the Catholic Church, and, under him, the Scotch bishops the only lawful spiritual governors of the portion of it in that part of the united kingdom, and shall promise to his diocesan such canonical obedience as is usually paid by the Scotch clergy to their respective ordinances; and shall declare, that, as no lay-power can confer, neither can it deprive bishops or clergy of their spiritual authority. Every such clergyman who, after duly considering the subject, may entertain serious scruples against the Scotch Communion-Office, shall be at liberty to use the English one in his own congregation; but, when occasionally required to communicate with any of his brethren, it shall be no objection on his part that the Scotch Office is then used.”

If you find, Sir, that any good can be done, I shall be happy to hear from you; and you may depend that no exertion shall be spared, nor information withheld, on my part, that can be of service; nor will I take any step that shall not previously, or after-

afterwards, as far as I am able to judge, receive the sanction of the Scotch bishops.

I have the honour to be,

REV. SIR,

Your most obedient humble Servant,
ROGER AITKEN.

2. *To the Rev. ROGER AITKEN, Aberdeen.*

REV. SIR,

Brechin, October 4, 1792.

AS your letter, directed to me in England, has at length found its way here, I feel myself bound in civility, from this easy distance, to return you an answer.—A person of more quick resentments, considering it as I am almost tempted to do, would probably have treated the communication with far less respect: but, indeed, there seems a propriety in your being informed how impossible it is for me to become the instrument of *such* proposals; at the bare mention of which, I conceive that every English clergyman would revolt with abhorrence.

I may observe, in the first place, that the obedience of the Scotch Episcopal clergy to their respective ordinaries is a matter of no very public notoriety; and therefore, that the obligation of such a promise as you mention would remain wholly unascertained, and would involve us in ties of endless implication.—But there are other conditions, which, while some of them, in addition to the proposed canonical obedience, *seem to be* useless on the one hand, are still more obviously offensive to the other party. The English clergy, Sir, will not abjure his Majesty's supremacy over them; to the affirmation of which, in all cases ecclesiastical as well as civil, they have

each, at his ordination, *ex animo*, subscribed and sworn : nor will they, I am certain, make any hostile declaration against the lawfulness of that authority, which the legislature has thought fit to give to the established presbytery of this country. And, lastly, as little will they admit a doctrine of occasional conformity in the administration of a worship, in which they cannot at all times conscientiously officiate.

Thus, Sir, I am sorry to observe, that our union is impossible : but, I trust, we shall not, therefore, on either side, forget that, though our labours remain separate, we are not necessarily *opposed* to each other. On our part, at least, no breath of invective will disturb that peace which so becomingly subsists at present among ministers of every denomination in Scotland : We will discharge our duty to those members of the Church of England, inhabitants of this country, who form our congregations ; we will do *this* with faithful diligence, and in the strictest delicacy of principle : but we will encourage no schism in any other communion ; nor, under the plausible pretext of a more fervent zeal,—a zeal surely *not* “ according to knowledge,”—condescend to those dissingenuous artifices which are not more derogatory to the honour of gentlemen than inconsistent with Christian charity.

I have the honour to be,

REV. SIR,

Your most obedient, humble Servant,

THO. WATSON.

P. S. As paragraphs have been suffered to appear, in most of the London and country news-papers, indirectly reflecting on the English clergy who have not united their congregations to yours, you cannot, Sir, object to the publication of this correspondence.

3. To the Rev. THO. WATSON, Brechin.

REV. SIR,

Aberdeen, October 9, 1792.

WHEN, under the character of an *English* clergyman, "nourished in the bosom of the *English* church, and faithfully attached to her doctrines and discipline *," you invited me to correspond with you relative to an union between the two Episcopal churches in Scotland; I concluded you were well acquainted with the foundation and nature of Episcopal government, and would seriously endeavour to promote that Christian unity in this country which, in England, is the object of the doctrines and discipline to which you profess to be faithfully attached. Your letter of the 4th instant has shewn me that I was mistaken. Instead of endeavouring to put an end to a schism, which, I do say, is not to be paralleled in the annals of the Christian church, (because there can be no reason for a division between two parties professing in all respects the same principles, for so those two communions do by calling themselves like the Church of England); you have come to Scotland, I find, purposely to share in it; and you speak of it in terms which shew you to be already tainted with all the errors and prejudices of the party. Without taking time to reflect on the importance of the object, or the expediency of the means for attaining it, you have boldly declared an union impossible, although, had you seen the articles which were to form its basis, and of which I

* "A very just character;" for, Mr. Aitken's correspondent is a native of *England* himself, is of *English* parents, was ordained by an *English* archbishop, and was the resident minister of an *English* parish.

gave you only some general hints, you would have been satisfied, as others have been already, that there were no grounds for the objections you make.

Though, in those articles, the Scotch bishops require the English ordained clergy to promise the like obedience that is paid by their own clergy, (and which, I must say, is extremely reasonable,) you would not be "involved in ties of endless implication."—I ask you, Sir, Do the English clergy promise no obedience at their ordination; or, are the particular ties resulting from it enumerated?—I apprehend that a general promise of canonical obedience, which is expressed in the same words, and must therefore be of the same extent in the ordinals of both churches, means no more than a submission to their ordinances in matters relating to the worship and discipline of the church; so far as the same are agreeable to scripture and catholic practice. Therefore the English clergy, who, on such terms, unite with our bishops, will be required to do no more than they would be *required*, and would be *obliged*, and have already *promised*, to do, were they holding cures in England.

From a perusal of the articles, you would have found that which treats of the supreme head of the church as harmless as the one which requires canonical obedience. A provision is made for the satisfaction of those who have taken the oath of supremacy; but our church never intended, nor yet the church of England as far as I am able to understand her doctrines, to invest the king with that spiritual authority which alone belongs to Christ, who, if we are to believe St. Paul, is *HEAD over all things to his Church*. The kingdom of Christ, and the kingdoms of the world, are as distinct as any two things in nature. Their government and laws are severally adapted to their different objects, and are administered by officers whose jurisdictions can never interfere;

interfere ; their departments being as different as the things of the heaven and the things of the earth can make them. As the spiritual governors of the various provinces of Christ's kingdom, or church, receive their authority from him alone, and not from any civil power, so no civil power can take it from them. Bishops and clergy have at different periods been deprived of their temporalities by the civil magistrate ; but it yet remains to be proved that they were *ipso facto* deprived of their spiritual authority. The supremacy attributed by the Church of England, and also by the Scotch Episcopal Church, to the king, is, in the words of the 37th article, that " he " should rule all estates and degrees committed to " his charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical " or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the " stubborn and evil doers ;" a position denied under the establishment of Popery, which exempted ecclesiastics from regal jurisdiction.

When I said that the use of the English Communion-Office would be allowed to such of the English ordained clergy as might have scruples to the Scotch-Office, I did not conceive that their scruples could possibly be founded on the unlawfulness of this Office, because in all respects it corresponds with the most ancient liturgies that are now extant ; and it has been acknowledged, by some of the most pious and learned men of the Church of England, to be more perfect than their own.—But I supposed that, from their habitual use of the English Office, or from their fear of offending their congregations, of which some of them had been in the practice, from no very good motive, I am afraid, of representing our Office as a relic of Popery, they might not chuse, for some time at least, to use that Office themselves, though they might have no objection to communicate with another clergyman who happened to administer by it.

What you mean by " disingenuous practices, derogatory to the honour of gentlemen," I know

not: let the cause that needs them rest on such rotten pillars. Our church needs no such artifices, nor does she hold forth to her children what the world calls *honour*, and of which she entertains no high idea, as a motive for action. Her maxims are, "Approve yourselves in all things as ministers of God;" "keep a conscience void of offence," and "hold fast the faithful word, that ye may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers."—On these maxims she hath persevered, and fought her way, through good report and bad report, for the last hundred years; and now that the black clouds of adversity have dispersed, and she hath been laid open to the world, no man can point out a speck upon her. She will not, therefore, barter her integrity for an union which, whatever advantages it may yield to the other party, can hold out no temptation to her equal to the sacrifice.

I am equally at a loss for your meaning, when you say, "Nor will the English clergy, I am certain, make any hostile declaration against the lawfulness of that authority which the legislature has thought fit to give to the established presbytery of this country." What your motive could be for thus bringing in presbytery by the head and shoulders, is best known to yourself. Not a syllable was there in my letter, nor is there in any of the articles, relative to presbytery. However, I know of no authority that the legislature has given, or can give, to presbytery, which can attach upon the consciences, or ought to direct the conduct, of those whose religious principles differ from those of the established church. I am persuaded, none of the ministers of that church, with whom I have the honour to be acquainted, will think the better of an Episcopal clergyman for sacrificing his principles to a mistaken complaisance; but will rather, even while they differ from him in principle, esteem the man who, with undeviating

undeviating rectitude, discharges the duties expressed, or implied, in his ordination-vows.—That the sanction of civil government is the test of religious truth is the favourite doctrine of too many who, from their profession, ought to know better: but the argument would prove too much. It might bring our Episcopal Clergymen to worship the host; or to confess Mahomet to be the prophet of God; or to bow the knee in an Indian pagoda.

Your principles and ours, Sir, differ materially. You seem to consider Episcopacy and Presbytery equally the offspring of political contingency; and as they stand, so they must fall, with the will of the legislature. On this principle you can feel no conscientious regard for Episcopal Government; but we, who believe it to be a *divine* institution, feel ourselves impelled to guard it with unceasing watchfulness. On no other ground can we justify the separation we have maintained from the established church. And, while we act in this manner, we think ourselves sufficiently warranted in having the universal practice of the Christian Church during the first three centuries.

Though this letter has already swelled beyond the limits I had prescribed, I cannot conclude it without taking the liberty to tell you, that, when you speak of the inhabitants of this country being members of the Church of England, you deceive them—you *deceive* yourself. While you remain as you are, you belong to *no* church.—The inhabitants of Brechin, to whom you now officiate, can no more be subject in spirituals to the Bishop of London (their supposed bishop) than in temporals to the Mayor of London's jurisdiction. Spiritual society requires subordination and order as much as civil; and they must be preserved in both by the same means. Governors in each must have distinct provinces; and in no respect has the Catholic church

C

been

been more accurate than in the rules she has laid down relative to the Episcopal Jurisdiction. The Church of England, having her government formed on the primitive model, has, by arguments drawn from Catholic Practice, maintained her constitution against the Popish supremacy; which is not more absurd than the jurisdiction of an English bishop over congregations in Scotland. To support what I say, I might quote the writings of every eminent English divine who has treated of church-government; but I will content myself with one living authority, the great ornament of the English bench, (Bishop of St. David's,) who, in the debate on our bill last session, expressed himself thus: "The credit of Episcopacy will never be advanced by the scheme of supplying the Episcopalians in Scotland with pastors of *our* ordination; and for this reason, that it would be an *imperfect crippled Episcopacy* that would thus be upheld in Scotland. When a clergyman, ordained by one of us, settles as a pastor of a congregation in Scotland, *he is out of the reach of our authority*. We have *no authority* there; we *can have no authority* there; the legislature can *give us no authority* there.—No bishop, who knows what he does, ordains without a title; and a title must be a nomination to something certain *in the diocese of the bishop that ordains*. But an appointment to an Episcopal Congregation in Scotland is no more a title to me, or to any bishop of the English bench, or any bishop of the Irish bench, than an appointment to a church in Mesopotamia." I remain,

REV. SIR,

Your most humble Servant,

ROGER AITKEN.

P. S. I have not seen any of the paragraphs you mention; and, though I had, I see no connexion
3 between

between them and this private correspondence. If you have, therefore, sent my letter to be published, without my consent, I must say that you have not treated me with proper delicacy. However, if it is already dispatched, I expect that this shall immediately follow it.

Brechin, 19th October, 1792.

4. Mr. URBAN,

I Do not see in what sense the foregoing letters can be called a "*private* correspondence;" the subject of them is a *public* business, it is conducted by *professional* men, and originated in your Magazine; which is a *public* print, as I believe, of more extensive circulation and surer permanency than any other. Nor should I ever have thought of removing it from your pages, if I had not imagined, that the business would have gone forwards, and of course have swelled the correspondence probably to so great a bulk as might occasion a necessity for its separate appearance; of this, indeed, I should still be apprehensive, if it were not for the information which may be afforded on a subject undoubtedly of much public curiosity. I have no fear that your readers will condemn me for having neglected to treat my opponent "with proper delicacy;" though I certainly shall allow myself all the freedom of round and explicit language, and *speak out*, and *print out*. When, after having been entrusted to open an anonymous signature, his ignorance of which might, it seems, have kept him more *to the purpose*, Mr. Aitkin has had the "delicacy" to controvert a public dispute into a personal attack, let him not, Mr. Urban, deny me liberty to come to the light, lest his generosity also be like his "delicacy," and it be inferred of me, as of

my excellent friend, that he is ashamed “ *to shew his face.*” My concealment now cannot be of use; and it may be proper enough to affix a real name to the attestation of such facts as I *must* publish in justification of my own conduct and letter in particular, and, what is of more consequence, of those English congregations in Scotland, who have so generally declined to unite with the usages; otherwise, the public may reasonably imagine, that the high applauses, bestowed in almost every news-paper through the kingdom on the union at Bamff, imply an irrefragable censure on other congregations, when they hear that such an example has not been seconded.

Far contrary to Mr. Aitkin’s suggestion, I came into Scotland chiefly with a view of promoting the union; which I then thought both practicable, and, on such grounds as we might reasonably expect, desirable. I supposed that services might be acceptable to both parties from an hand which had never partaken in “their opposition;” and a connexion with one of the English chapels seemed to me a favourable opportunity to entitle an interference, which might before have looked rather obtrusive. I came, Sir, as probably every Englishman would come, with prejudice in favour of the Scotch bishops, a body of men, whom I looked upon as unfortunate, and though justly, yet hardly, treated; not taking time to consider, that, though pity might be due to the deprived bishops, there can be no reason for extending it to their supposed successors, *who* never were in a better situation than at present, and who, by introducing those “usages” in the Communion-office, which distinguish theirs from the English worship, were themselves the authors of that schism they now so loudly complain of. Surprized, however, to find, in all my conversation with the members of my congregation, that their aversion to the Nonjurors, or (as we should now rather call them) “usagers,” proceeded as much
at

at least from their distrust of *the men* as from the difference in principles, I began to investigate, with all the attention I was capable of, the history of this division, from such materials as have been *published* by the usagers themselves, and from some original and authentic papers, chiefly from those of bishop Auchterlonie, and of another gentleman more lately deceased; and it is from *such* sources that I have already imbibed all *those* "errors and prejudices" that are *so liberally* ascribed to me!

The next charge against me is for judging "without having seen the articles" agreed upon by their bishops, the sight of which I did not, and do not still, know how to obtain. But why did not those bishops themselves prevent this charge, by publicly transmitting their overtures to the ministers of the other communion? Such a conduct would have looked better than the suffering them to be communicated *privately* to opulent members of *our* congregations*. Or, why did not Mr. Aitkin transmit to me the articles at length, instead of what he first called their "substance," and then but "general hints?" In your Magazine (LXII.497), I mentioned expressly, that I wanted "the *specific* "conditions required by the Scotch bishops." Why then did he in answer send only "hints" insufficient for our information? Or, if the articles be so assuredly unobjectionable, why did he *still again* omit to send them? They would have been, I conceive, more *to the purpose* than all the "delicacy" he has displayed; and, probably, there has not been occasion

* You may prevent the temerity of defiance, and save yourself a little trouble, Mr. Urban, by giving an instance, as you are authorized to do by J. Brand, esq. of Lawrieston. The articles were communicated to that gentleman by a neighbour, who afterwards excited his surprize, by discovering a correspondence on the grounds of Mr. B's objections with bishop Strachan, of Dundee, formerly factor (steward) for the estate of Lawrieston, but not in any particular confidence with its present proprietor. T. W.

to make them longer than his last letter. With respect to the articles themselves, all I now add is only in explanation of what I wrote before to Mr. Aitkin; not because I doubt of their being in substance the same as what he sent me, but, because I think that an union *on those grounds*,—an union implying neither coincidence in principle, nor uniformity of worship,—would be an object of not much *desirable* “importance” on the one hand, and, on the other, of some ill consequences, as it might disturb that unanimity within our congregations which at present subsists there.

If the canonical obedience, required by the Scotch ordinaries from their clergy, be of the same extent as that paid by the clergy of England to their bishops; why might not the latter, being better known to us, have been made the *measure* of our duty? May it not be, Sir, because there are, in connexion with *this*, certain troublesome incumbrances called acts of parliament, made by a set of men, who, not so quick-sighted as Mr. Aitken, have thought the distinction between civil and religious government *not* quite so clear as even “the things of the earth” could make it. It will be called, perhaps, another of my erroneous “prejudices,” when I acknowledge a ruling maxim in my mind, *that those, who are most jealous of the civil power, commonly make a bad use of their own*: yet, upon proper security for the uniformity of our worship with that of the Church of England,—that is, for a *permanent* and total suppression of the usages, a *sine-qua-non* with *us*,—such explanatory declarations might be invented, as would make *at least this* article satisfactory. But, without such a security, I have no hesitation to assert again, that the projected union is “*impossible* :” for, who is there that will not receive with abhorrence any less proposal, after he has submitted, as every English clergyman has done, in the words of the 36th canon, “That he
“ himself

“ himself will use the form in the said book prescribed” (the English Common Prayer Book) “ in public prayer, *and administration of the sacraments, and none other.*”

Every English clergyman has likewise subscribed, in the words of the same canon, That the king “ only ” is, “ *under God,*” supreme in England, “ *and all other* ” his dominions and countries, “ as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical *things or causes* as temporal.” But Mr. Aitken says, that, for our satisfaction on this head, they have made a provision. It may be so, Sir; but he should have inserted *the clause* in his letter, and thereby have allowed us the additional satisfaction of seeing that it is sufficient. Yet, still, of what *use* would such a declaration be as that proposed to us by the Scotch bishops, *after we had sworn canonical obedience*, unless it be designed as an act of *unprovoked* hostility against the presbytery, which is established by the subscribing government, by those “ powers that be,” which “ are ordained of God?” We, who wish to follow the apostle’s injunction one step farther, and, “ *as far as lieth in us,*” to “ live peaceably with all men,” we conceive that these considerations “ ought to attach upon our consciences, and direct our conduct,” though our “ principles differ from those of the established church*.”

On a late occasion it was justly argued, in the House of Peers, that the question, which alone deserved attention from their lordships, was simply this : Do this body of dissenters from the established church of Scotland hold principles *fit to be tolerated?* A

* I object to the proposed declaration, Sir, on these grounds, not from any flattering “ complaisance ” towards the ministers of the establishment, with none of whom “ I have the honour to be acquainted,” or very anxiously wish to have ; not, however, through the smallest disrespect, but because it is agreeable to me to have very little acquaintance at all.

nobleman,

nobleman, then high in office, and whose strong penetration authorizes the distinguished deference always paid to his opinion—he thought the house not fully assured of this. Their principles, in his lordship's opinion, “are not sufficiently *known*.” It appears *now*, Sir, that one of their indispensable “articles” *unnecessarily* resists the interference of the sovereign, or that of the whole legislature, in any matters of ecclesiastical *government*; declaring “the Scotch bishops the only lawful spiritual governors” of Scotland; and Mr. Aitken insists, that with theirs the jurisdiction of the civil officers can “never interfere.” Will it then be improper if we ask, Did Parliament think this principle “*fit to be tolerated*?” Or, in the plenitude of creating and dispensing power, was *such* a requisition determined upon *since* then? Or, lastly, Sir, was it suppressed on *that* occasion? That the legislature does not regard this claim of power as “*fit to be tolerated*,” I gather hence: by an express law [25th Hen. VIII.] it has, *ever since the Reformation*, denied the exercise of one less exorbitant to the convocation of the Church of England; and *now* even confines *her* spiritual government to the canons already enacted. Yet the English clergy are a very numerous and respectable body of men indeed; and I venture to conceive, that the opinion entertained of their integrity, their abilities, and learning, may be so high, that an authority, with the execution of which it is not deemed prudent to entrust them, would never be *designedly* acknowledged as any where subsisting *independently and without appeal*, but in a representation of *the whole* nation, that is, in the three estates of the legislature.

In order to obtain this act of relief, the Episcopalian of the Scottish order consented to ascertain their principles, in some degree, by subscribing the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England; and in the
“case”

“ case,” which they stated, previous to their application for it, and which was printed and distributed among the members of both houses of Parliament, it is affirmed, that their “ religious tenets and doctrines are, *in the strictest sense*, the doctrines and “ tenets of the Church of England;” yet, Sir, does Mr. Aitken, the very same gentleman who was then *the secretary of their deputation* in London, already stand forward in your pages, to defend and maintain those doctrines and tenets, even *sacramental* as well as ecclesiastical, in which he confesses they *differ* from us.

But when Mr. Aitken insists, that the government and laws of spiritual and civil rulers are directed to objects so distinct “ that their jurisdictions can never “ interfere,” surely he argues against the plainest reason, against matter of fact, against the common consent of mankind and universal experience. For, who does not know, that men have ever been influenced in politics by their opinions concerning church government, and that this must ever be the case, in some degree, so long as the wills and understandings of men shall remain imperfect, and so long as the propriety of our civil conduct shall form a part of moral duty? A principle hostile to the sovereign’s supremacy “ in ecclesiastical “ things or causes,” it is an undeniable fact, *has* influenced the *nonjurors* in particular; it is implied even in the very name by which they have hitherto been distinguished; it has uniformly cemented their unconstitutional attachment to the house of Stuart, an attachment which remained till they lost its last object, and thereby the very latest opportunity to continue it.

To my humble conception, the chief occasion of these difficulties appears to arise merely from a neglect of distinguishing in our minds and language be-

nobleman, then high in office, and whose strong penetration authorizes the distinguished deference always paid to his opinion—he thought the house not fully assured of this. Their principles, in his lordship's opinion, “are not sufficiently *known*.” It appears *now*, Sir, that one of their indispensable “articles” *unnecessarily* resists the interference of the sovereign, or that of the whole legislature, in any matters of ecclesiastical *government*; declaring “the Scotch bishops the only lawful spiritual governors” of Scotland; and Mr. Aitken insists, that with theirs the jurisdiction of the civil officers can “never interfere.” Will it then be improper if we ask, Did Parliament think this principle “*fit to be tolerated*?” Or, in the plenitude of creating and dispensing power, was *such* a requisition determined upon *since* then? Or, lastly, Sir, was it suppressed on *that* occasion? That the legislature does not regard this claim of power as “*fit to be tolerated*,” I gather hence: by an express law [25th Hen. VIII.] it has, *ever since the Reformation*, denied the exercise of one less exorbitant to the convocation of the Church of England; and *now* even confines *her* spiritual government to the canons already enacted. Yet the English clergy are a very numerous and respectable body of men indeed; and I venture to conceive, that the opinion entertained of their integrity, their abilities, and learning, may be so high, that an authority, with the execution of which it is not deemed prudent to entrust them, would never be *designedly* acknowledged as any where subsisting *independently and without appeal*, but in a representation of *the whole* nation, that is, in the three estates of the legislature.

In order to obtain this act of relief, the Episcopalians of the Scottish order consented to ascertain their principles, in some degree, by subscribing the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England; and in the
“case”

“ case,” which they stated, previous to their application for it, and which was printed and distributed among the members of both houses of Parliament, it is affirmed, that their “ religious tenets and doctrines are, *in the strictest sense*, the doctrines and “ tenets of the Church of England;” yet, Sir, does Mr. Aitken, the very same gentleman who was then *the secretary of their deputation* in London, already stand forward in your pages, to defend and maintain those doctrines and tenets, even *sacramental* as well as ecclesiastical, in which he confesses they *differ* from us.

But when Mr. Aitken insists, that the government and laws of spiritual and civil rulers are directed to objects so distinct “ that their jurisdictions can never “ interfere,” surely he argues against the plainest reason, against matter of fact, against the common consent of mankind and universal experience. For, who does not know, that men have ever been influenced in politics by their opinions concerning church government, and that this must ever be the case, in some degree, so long as the wills and understandings of men shall remain imperfect, and so long as the propriety of our civil conduct shall form a part of moral duty? A principle hostile to the sovereign’s supremacy “ in ecclesiastical “ things or causes,” it is an undeniable fact, *has* influenced the *nonjurors* in particular; it is implied even in the very name by which they have hitherto been distinguished; it has uniformly cemented their unconstitutional attachment to the house of Stuart, an attachment which remained till they lost its last object, and thereby the very latest opportunity to continue it.

To my humble conception, the chief occasion of these difficulties appears to arise merely from a neglect of distinguishing in our minds and language be-

D

tween

tween the *power of the keys*, or *spiritual commission*, by which men are authorized in the actual *administration* of the sacraments, and other ordinances of religion, and a power barely *juridical*, for the regulation and government of the church. The *spiritual* and the *ecclesiastical* authority are indeed often considered as inseparable, and we are accustomed to use those two words indifferently, as though they were exactly synonymous; yet no one will suppose the king to be a bishop or a priest. Consecrations, ordinations, and other divine offices, from the royal hand, are absurd in supposition, and would be invalid in act. The king is not a religious minister; he has not the *spiritual commission* for the duties of administration. But the Church of England declares, that the *supreme ecclesiastical authority* does attach to his civil rights; that the election and consecration of bishops, and of course the ordination of inferior clergy, in his dominions, cannot take place virtually and in truth but by his appointment; and she conceives, that any, which may be affirmed to have taken place, in whatever country, *under a Christian civil government*, are invalid, are not authorized by Christ our HEAD, are "not according to the word of God," unless they have the consent of the civil legislature, the approbation of that branch of it to which such a power is entrusted by the whole.

That all human legislatures are but bodies of fallible men, sometimes erroneous in their judgements, and, from various causes, sometimes wrong in particular acts, is what no one will attempt to deny; and *we*, on our part, shall readily acknowledge, that they have the *power*, within their respective jurisdictions, to suppress, to tolerate, or to establish, Episcopacy, or any other divine institution; though we believe, that a *total suppression* of any of them will never be suffered by divine Providence to become universal. Whether any *partial* or *local suppression* be an act
right

right in its own nature, and in the sight of God, *may* depend on circumstances open to his eye only, and it were unnecessary and presumptuous for us to say. But, if it be called an error, or even a crime, it is yet an act of the supreme authority on earth, and can be judged only by HIM who is exempt from error. To endeavour to preserve and promote Episcopacy, and every other institution of God our Saviour, is indeed the duty of all his servants; but it is their duty to do this *by legal and constitutional means*; nor are they bound in conscience to use *even these* for the *establishment* of those institutions by the civil authority, unless they are convinced, upon full and sufficient enquiry, that their religion cannot be preserved and promoted without a political *establishment*. National establishments of religion are supported for purposes of civil government; and, probably at least, no civil government can long continue without some. But the national faith is not *therefore* the true faith; for, then, what is true in one country will be false in another. Happily, however, though civil government cannot subsist without religion, religion can subsist without the aid of civil power. In Scotland we have no bishops, but we have an Episcopal religion; because, while there are bishops in other countries, our congregations can be supplied with pastors of their ordination.

The English communion in Scotland does not pretend to be under the *jurisdiction* of *any* bishop; but surely it has reason to consider itself as by no means destitute of the *protection* of the prelates of the English bench. The bishops of London have been the most frequently troubled; it has been merely upon the supposition that their situation was most convenient to both sides for the transaction of business with any distant appendages of the empire or church; part of which only (the West-India islands) have the happiness to be subject to *authority*. But here I must

be understood as using this word in the sense of " legal power ;" and this is the sense in which it is used by the Bishop of St. David's, in the passage of his lordship's speech quoted by Mr. Aitken. In another, a secondary, sense, however, " support,—justification,—countenance,—influence,—and credit," [Johnson], we trust we may count, upon the *authority* of the English prelacy, as extended to us, so far as it can be conveniently exercised. Whenever any of their lordships have thought proper to use this among us—if indeed they ever *have* used it in aught of consequence—I venture to conceive, and with some reason too, that their recommendations have met with a reception, both from the clergy and laity, as obedient, and thankful, and efficient, as in any diocese in England, where their jurisdiction is enforced by " legal power." But this is not all ; for, supposing that we have no real connexion whatever with the English church,—with which, however, we are in perfect religious communion, and whose liturgy, rubrics, and canons, are precisely and uniformly the rule of our worship and conduct,—still, Mr. Urban, it remains yet to be proved, that the submission which is *not* due to the English prelates *does* therefore become the right of these gentlemen, *in their present circumstances*, who call themselves bishops in Scotland. Mr. Aitken does not need to be told, that we do not confess this ; though we value peace too much to raise any dispute about titles or authority which they assume only in relation to their own religious society. For the tenet of the power of the keys, on whichever side of us we look, we, like the Bishop of St. David's, " may be supposed to have some respect ;" but we have never admitted, that *even this* spiritual power can be given to any man, in a Christian country, without the consent of the civil government ; nor, if it could, do we acknowledge that, in fact,

it

it *has* been so transmitted to the supposed Scotch bishops.

My principles truly *are* very different from those of the usagers, though not in that respect in which Mr. Aitken affirms, first, that they “are,” and then, with more caution, that they “seem” to be. I also maintain Episcopacy to be a divine institution; but I acknowledge civil government to be such too, though *which are the men* that shall be rulers, either *under* the one or the other, is a matter of another nature, and is left to be settled on earth by human legislation. St. Paul could be satisfied to exercise his ecclesiastical authority in conjunction with laymen*; and so ought every succeeding governor in the Christian church. Nor have we any cause to repine; for, our bishops form no inconsiderable part of the legislative body, in which, at least in ecclesiastical concerns, they always have their weight. And let us also remember, that if the Church of England is made subject to the king’s supremacy, so must that king himself be a member of the Church of England “as by law established:” while the Scotch bishops, being, as they report, independent of civil power, can own a popish king, or make their worship popery, any thing, in short, that they please to make it; an authority surely rather too weighty for *their* strength.

But suppose, Mr. Urban, that we were at once released from all these obligations religious and civil; still that would not remove our objections to the usages: suppose we admit that Mr. Aitken has the practice of the three first centuries on his side, will this justify the use of other *elements* in our holy sacrament than those “ordained by *Christ himself*?” We have every scriptural evidence, that “bread and “wine” *only* were used by our Saviour; and shall we

* 2 Cor. ii. 10.

then presume to use water, because wine *and water* appears to the usagers to resemble more perfectly the "blood and water" which issued from his side when pierced by the soldiers' spears? We might next think (for it would be only one step farther), that the *real flesh and blood* of bulls and of goats, the eminent Jewish types of the one great propitiatory sacrifice, would more visibly represent the body and blood of Christ; or where *must* we stop so licentious a fancy?—Again: when Mr. Aitken, in his consecration of the sacramental bread and wine, invokes the Father, "*that they may become the body and blood*" of our Saviour, he may, in his own mental reservation, design, as he tells you in his letter, "the *sacramental*, not the *real*, body and blood:" but *that* will not appear to common sense to be the plain grammatical meaning of *the words*; on the contrary, the passage will appear to favour so strongly of transubstantiation, that *our* people surely are not far wrong in calling it a relic of popery. Our blessed Master, it is true, "took bread; and, when he had "given thanks," *in the just action and language of prophetic exemplification*, "he brake it, and said, "This is my body *which is broken* for you;" but surely this was very different from a deliberate invocation of the Father that it might "*become*" his body. This sacred rite was instituted on "*the same night that he was betrayed*;" it was to the apostles present a very impressive representation of the *violence* which his real body was immediately to suffer, and it remains such also to us, who obediently continue to "*do this*" in remembrance of his death and passion, and of the benefits which we thence receive. Sir, our "*God with us*" gave us this memorial and pledge of his love; we consider the constant preservation and observance of it, in the exact form

* 1 Cor. xi. 24.

which He prescribes, as the proper test of our gratitude, our obedience, our faith; and we *dare* not but refuse either to pollute the elements by an heterogeneous mixture, or sophisticate the doctrines by elusory metaphysics of human imagination: we *must* preserve the purity of our worship, and “*bold fast* that which is good.”

Respecting the “offering” of the bread and of the wine and water, which Mr. Aitken supposes to “become the body and blood” of Christ, it will not perhaps be necessary to repeat to your readers what has been already urged in our controversies with the Church of Rome. But, I suppose, I may remind this gentleman, that he *has* subscribed—for he has engaged to subscribe—in the 31st Article of Religion, that the sacrifices in which “the priest did offer Christ for the quick *and the dead*, to have remission of pain *or guilt*, were *blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits*.”

The last of the usages, peculiar to the Scotch Communion-Office, is that of prayer *for the dead*; on which, as Mr. Aitken acknowledges the fact, I shall not myself trouble you with one syllable of comment, but barely transcribe an explanation from their own “Catechism,” Edinburgh edition, 1752.

“*Quest.* Does the communion of saints extend to the other world?

“*Ans.* Yes; the church upon earth and the church in Paradise communicate together, by mutually praying for each other.

“*Quest.* Why do we pray for them?

“*Ans.* Because their present condition is imperfect, and therefore capable of improvement; and because they are to be judged at the last day, and will then stand in need of mercy*.”

Having

* It may not be improper to mention, that the Scotch Communion-Office *has been* several times reprinted by the usagers themselves

Having now gone through with the usages themselves, indeed, Sir, *as briefly* as I can, and, I trust, not uncandidly,—it will not be necessary to add much to what I have already written on the authority by which they were enacted. This Mr. Aitken seems willing to rest on the practice of the three first centuries, and the independency of what he calls the Church of Scotland on that of England. I again refer him to his subscription respecting even “general councils,” in the 21st Article of Religion; presuming that he will consider it as *at least equally* applicable to its present object: “That things, ordained by *them* as “necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor “authority, unless it may be declared that they be “taken out of *holy Scripture*.”

At last, however, I am very glad to come to a point on which I shall perfectly agree with Mr. Aitken; namely, the very high attention due from me, or from any man, to an opinion from the Bishop of St. David's. Let a clergyman, Mr. Urban, out of the way of his authority, or his favour, express his sense of the almost unparalleled services done by this great prelate to the English church; let me be *forward* to acknowledge, that he *is a* very bright ornament to his high station, and that, if I could be compelled to subscribe to the infallibility of any man, I should wish it might be that of Dr. Horsley. But farther than this, Sir, I cannot go. In the instance quoted by Mr. Aitken, I confess that I have presumed to think his lordship is mistaken. All the English bishops, who have hitherto ordained ministers for Scotland, have certainly thought that a title for holy orders needs not necessarily be *within the diocese*.

themselves in a separate pamphlet, though, considering their late circumstances, probably not published; and that, according to your desire, I would have sent you a copy, if I had had one of *my own*, or had known where to obtain one for you.

It is true, those are the words of the 33d canon; but the canon provides for *England* only, as the extent of its *authority*, and as a country the whole of which is divided into parishes, under episcopal government, and each parish therein *legally* provided with a minister, with whose charge the new clergyman is not to interfere. That Convocation meant no limit with respect to Scotland, in its present situation, and other foreign countries, may be seen from the preamble, where the design of passing this canon is expressly said to be only, That none should be admitted "either deacon or priest, who had not first
" some certain place where he might use his function;" an objection which does not apply to these titles. It is on these grounds alone that we can justify the consecration of foreign *bishops also* by our prelacy; and, on the same grounds, if the measure were thought advisable, might the consecration be justified of any English minister, who has already a charge in Scotland acknowledged and licensed by the civil power. Nay, farther, clergymen ordained by *such* a prelate in North-Britain might be acknowledged by the parent church *in England*, provided that such ordination had been performed "according
" to the form and manner prescribed and used by
" the Church of England;" and that the clergyman so ordained had also, *previous* to the ceremony, *in the presence of the bishop*, and "in due form of law,
" taken the oaths appointed" by the law of England
"to be taken for and instead of the oath of supremacy; and he likewise having freely and voluntarily
" subscribed to the XXXIX articles of religion, and
" to the three articles contained in the 36th canon." All this, however, upon entering England, he must again subscribe before his new diocesan *. A design
of

* It was asked some time since, by one of your correspondents,
" In what light the Church of England looks upon the clergy-
E " men

of settling beyond the reach of their authority, or a title that lies beyond its reach, does not, I humbly conceive, in law, prevent English bishops from admitting men into holy orders, nor in conscience justify their refusal. The title given by a nobleman to his chaplain, more especially that of a *Scotch* nobleman, is also, I apprehend, beyond the reach of the authority of any English bishop; and yet, I presume, that *such* a title *must* be acknowledged as good in law.

The measures of government, with respect to the Scotch Episcopalians, have been, no doubt, in a due degree, and may be in future, influenced by the opinion of the bishop of St. David's; yet the highest mental endowments cannot afford security against misinformation; and, if it were not too great a presumption to suppose I should be called upon, I would engage to prove—*absit invidia verbo*—to the full consent of his lordship's candour,—that the same measures, if persisted in, and without such qualifications as there is now no particular reason to expect, will be followed by effects precisely *the* very reverse of *his* wish, and the wish of every honest man in the kingdom who understands its religion and laws. However, as I cannot with propriety here state the reasoning by which I should substantiate the assertion, it is but just to add, that it implies no reflection on the usagers.—But, Sir, may not the opinion of this great prelate concerning us, formed at so great a distance as Abergwilly or St. Alban's, have been affected by representations that we “*meddle with those that are given to change* ;” that we are Republicans and Socinians?

“men ordained by Scotch usage bishops since *they* have taken the oaths?” For an answer he is referred to a clause in the act of parliament. It will not be improper, I humbly conceive, if government take care that the requisitions of the act be complied with, and that the ministers of that communion in fact *do* take the oaths and subscribe.

It

It may not be amiss for you to tell the world a plain fact;—that, not three months ago, when an English clergyman came to take charge of a congregation of Episcopalians in an obscure corner of Scotland, many miles North from the capital, he found that congregation in every respect of the contrary principles, and, as he has every reason to think, uniformly *to a man*; nay, that, *previous* to his engagement (*they* having particular cause to suspect a Cambridge clergyman), their orthodoxy was carefully stated to him, and their attachment in particular to the Athanasian creed. Say too, Mr. Urban, that ministers of the Church of England, even here, have not “taught rebellion to her sons;” that they have been careful to preserve them to the utmost of their power, as perfectly constitutional in their political as orthodox in their religious tenets; that they are generally the most enthusiastic admirers both of Monarchy and of the Monarch. Nor is theirs a new-fangled loyalty, but, at the least, *as* old, and hitherto *as* secure, as that of any description of men on the face of the island. In several respectable congregations I fully *know* this to be the case, and I have good reason to believe it of the rest. In the particular one just alluded to, these *principles* have been systematically cultivated during the long labours of a most exemplary, learned, diligent, and faithful, pastor *, and with such effect, that, humanly speaking, they *cannot* be eradicated in the *present* generation. Say, that already has their new minister had the pleasure to sit by, and hear them talking in common conversation of the wisdom and virtues of a beloved Prince, and pointing out some of the particular blessings that have distinguished his reign. At their homes and fire-sides, while partaking of the elegant enjoyments of domes-

* Mr. Sievwright. See your Vol. LX. p. 681.

tic ease, with a high satisfaction have they been observed to enumerate his wakeful watchings over an invaluable constitution in the hour of danger; when by his own royal hand our ruin has been nipped in the bud, and the attempts of ambition suppressed at once, without noise or tumult, before either voice or cry was heard. Tell me not, Sir, that he must share this gratitude chiefly with his servants; but tell me whose penetration at first distinguished such servants,—when many were young, most new and unproved, and at such a time, too, in the perilous moment of general desertion, when a herd of gazing courtiers stood looking on, and saw their king unserved, their country *without* a government? What less discriminating prudence could have preserved so long a security to the persons and possessions of *such* subjects, among whom, every one, full with idleness and prosperity, fancies himself born for legislation? Who has been for more than thirty years the warmest promoter of all that can add to the respectability of public, or the felicity of private life? Who has been the *first* and greatest Patron of liberal and ornamental arts and useful science?—There are, Sir, among the English Episcopalians of Scotland, those who, *in their hearts, remember*—(for, who does not *know*?)—*all* this; then, whose honest sense can distinguish a moral and political Black-legs, though unversed in his despicable science, and who well know there *must* necessarily *be* merit about such as *his* impudence traduces. Whigs, it is true, they are in principle; such Whigs as those who settled the Protestant succession, yet, in the most favourable theatre of sedition, at a distance from the seat of government, will they live obedient and happy under a legitimate though Presbyterian civil power, and—tell it to the factious—if the days of commotion be not far absent [October, 1793], some there will be found, notwithstanding these truly Parisian arguments, which they acknowledge

acknowledge to have received, still recommending peace and submission to government, and prepared, we trust, to die for its defence.

But to return to the usagers: when Mr. Aitken boasts that, "where they give an oath, that oath will bind them, though it were to the hindrance of every worldly advantage," [p. 240.] does he mean to insinuate to your readers that the present Scotch bishops are not in as good a situation as either their attainments or their birth and connexions could have entitled them to expect in secular life? Or do they imagine that *they* could have been bishops under a national establishment? When he speaks thus of their oaths, and again challenges me, while *I did not accuse*, "to point out a speck upon them;" can he, who was himself, I understand, bred a law-writer, be ignorant, that, if such there were, we could not bring serious charges, like that of perjury, without much inconvenience, even where facts might be so notorious that, in a court of law, *only* proofs would be required?

Some things I have written in this letter, *I am sure, not with pleasure*, but by compulsion; and some which, with a painful truth, I had written *here*, I have yet *suppressed*. Let me continue, to the last, deaf to provocation; let not my hand tear open a wound already too wide, or do aught to prevent that cure, which another more fortunate may, with men of sounder principles and milder temper, be enabled at some future period to effect.

My last letter to Mr. Aitken gave no just occasion for *any* challenge; it was designed only "to provoke unto love, and to good works." Having shewn, as I thought, the impossibility of our union, I expressed my wish that we might not stand in "opposition" to each other;—a word which Mr. Aitken had used in his letter. On *our* part, I promised a strict abstinence from all "invective" in our discourses

ses and conversation, and in our conduct from all "illiberal artifices;" of which, for the better assurance, I expressed my detestation in warm terms, and I expected from him similar professions. To the sense of this part of my letter he seems "tremblingly alive" indeed: he says, that he does not understand its meaning: his imagination, however, has supplied one; and in *that* meaning also a "taxing," that does not, "like a wild goose, fly unclaim'd of any man." But surely, Sir, Mr. Aitken is not serious; for, he tells us that he does not know, either, what "the honour of gentlemen" means. I believe every one else knows, that it signifies *the moral sense, exercised with such delicate discrimination as is justly expected from persons of cultivated understanding.* This, I presume, is "the honour of gentlemen:" what Mr. Aitken talks of is the principle of cut-throats.

But now, Mr. Urban, I have done. For, I faithfully promise, after this paper has made its public appearance, never more to trouble you, or Mr. Aitken, or the public, with another syllable on this subject. Let him take the credit, if he pleases, of having silenced me. Yet I decline all farther correspondence, not from fear, or from anger, or even from contempt; but merely from the impossibility of doing good with a disputant, who calls on me continually to repress invectives, sometimes even personal, instead of sitting down to the discussion, as each should do, with a candid disposition, "a calm head, and cool spirits." Though it unluckily appears that he has not a command of temper, Mr. Aitken may have, as I have been told, some good qualities of the head and heart; but he should remember, that the esteem due to these *can* be appreciated only by their effects, by the cause and manner in which they are used.

THO. WATSON.

AP-

A P P E N D I X.

N^o I.

*Extracts of a Letter from Mr. Robert Wright, at
Edinburgh, to Mr. Robert Norie, at Dundee,
dated 24th March, 1720.*

An Original Paper.

“ I Do not doubt but you have heard of the loss
 “ we have sustained by the death of the bishop of
 “ Edinburgh, which happened very suddenly on Sa-
 “ turday last, at night, in his brother William’s
 “ chamber, who is also since dead. So soon as he
 “ was interred, three consecrated bishops, as them-
 “ selves doe own, to wit, Mr. Falconar at Carnbee,
 “ Mr. Miller at Leeth, and Mr. Irvine at Callander
 “ (my Lord Lithgow’s house), sent Mr. Middleton,
 “ their officer, to all the presbyters in this city and
 “ about it, to meet together at a place he named,
 “ at three hours after noon. I came there a little
 “ after they were convened, and had chosen their
 “ præsides Mr. Lumsden; who told us, it was thought
 “ fit by our bishops, that we in this juncture should
 “ have recourse to them for providing one to be our
 “ overseer, and reside in this place as our governor,
 “ to succeed him who was dead. After this speech
 “ Mr.

“ Mr. Middleton rose up, and said, our bishops
 “ were ready to make choice of one for that office;
 “ and so it was proper for us to own them as our
 “ superiors, and to supplicate them to exercise their
 “ office, and to provide accordingly; which was de-
 “ livered with a great deal of confidence and flat-
 “ tery. I rose up, when he had ended, and assured
 “ the brethren I would give all respect and deference
 “ to those who were consecrated to that holy function;
 “ but I refused to own them as my superiors, because
 “ they were only consecrated at first for preserving
 “ the order, and with power to ordain and confirm,
 “ and be suffragants, but no way to have any jurif-
 “ diction over presbyters.—In the time of con-
 “ sidering this proposal, Mr. Keith insinuated, that
 “ we were in the dark as to these bishops; not
 “ knowing but by report if they *were* consecrated,
 “ being clandestinely done; therefore he thought
 “ fit to see their diploma, or letters of consecration.
 “ Then Mr. Lamby opened a very little, and *did*
 “ second him. This they all agreed in;” &c.

Nº II.

From Mr. Keith's "Revenue of the Elections of Bishops in particular," p. 238; and Rattray's "Essay on the Nature of the Church," p. 59.

Mr. Falconar said, “ That though they were bi-
 “ shops of this church, intended for preserving the
 “ episcopal succession therein, yet they did not pre-
 “ tend

“ tend to have jurisdiction over any place or district.
 “ Therefore he, together with his colleague-bishops,
 “ advised the presbyters to elect a proper person to
 “ take the management of their affairs upon him.”
 Then the bishops withdrew.

N° III.

*From Dundas's “ Impartial Enquiry ” concerning
 Prayers for the Dead.*

The Formula against the usages, transmitted to
 Mr. Robert Norie, Dundee; and the Letter
 in which it was a second time inclosed.

“ Whereas the bishops of this national church of
 Scotland, viz. John, bishop of Edinburgh; Arthur
 Miller, bishop; William Irwine, bishop; Andrew
 Cant, bishop; David Freebairn, bishop; have repre-
 sented to us the present danger of the church; and
 that her peace and unity is like to be broken by the
 endeavours to introduce certain *usages*, such as the
 mixture of water with the wine in the celebration of
 the Holy Eucharist; Prayers for the Dead; and
 some others: Therefore we, whose names are under-
 written, being fully convinced of the danger which
 threatens the Church by the said usages, do faith-
 fully declare and promise, that, for preserving the
 peace and unity of the Church (which to all men
 ought to be very dear and precious), we shall not
 make any innovation in the doctrine and worship of
 this Church, as now received among us, by intro-
 ducing or practising the said usages.”

The LETTER.

“ Rev. Brother,

Forasmuch as we are informed, that there is a delay put to the subscribing of the Formula by the presbyters of Dundee and Meigle, upon the prospect of an accommodation, of which we know nothing; wherefore we desire you may be pleased to call them again together, and let them know, that we wonder they, who were inclined to subscribe, should have delayed it, when we were so positive in our first orders; and now we earnestly desire, that, without farther delay, ye prescribe the preceding Formula; and that you would give us an account of the rescuants,

<i>Edinburgh, April 29, 1723.</i>	{	Jo. bishop of Edinburgh,
Signed		<i>Arthur Miller</i> , bishop.
		Will. Irwine, bishop.
		And. Cant, bishop.
	Da. Freebairn, bishop.	

N^o IV.

Sentence of Suspension against Bishop Miller : from an original Copy.

Date June 28, 1727.

After recapitulation of charges, and of the modes of procedure upon them, it concludes thus : “ The college

college of bishops having maturely considered and advised the said evidences, they find it evident, that all the facts libelled are true; and that he, having declined, by the said *Letter* of this date, the unquestionable authority of the major part of the college, they find themselves obliged for recovering the peace and unity of this church, so miserably violated and broken by him, to suspend, and by these presents do suspend the said bishop, Arthur Miller, from the exercise of any part of the episcopal office within this National Church, and particularly within the diocese of Edinburgh, to which we have declared he has no right or title, *aye and while he give satisfaction* to our reasonable overtures formerly made to him both by word and writ, and appoint these presents to be intimated to the said bishop, Arthur Miller, and to the presbyters of the diocese of Edinburgh, that none concerned may pretend ignorance."

From the original subscribed Deed.

"We, the majority of the college of bishops convened at Edinburgh about the mighty affairs of this church, being well assured, that six or seven presbyters had taken upon them, without so much as acquainting their superiors, to elect Mr. William Dunbar to be bishop of Murray; and also that some presbyters, who had contemned the authority of the college of bishops, by refusing to subscribe the Formula some time ago, had elected Dr. Rattray, of Craig-

hall, to be bishop of Angus, Merns, &c. by virtue of a mandate from bishop Fullarton a few days before his death, when he was oppressed with a lethargy, and incapable of making a judgement concerning the smallest affair, and had no power to grant any such order without the concurrence of his colleagues; and that the said election was carried on after the death of that bishop, though, *mortuo mandante, moritur mandatum*: We being farther assured, that bishops Gardener, Miller, and Cant, had most uncanonically consecrated those two bishops without the knowledge and consent of their colleagues; and that these two lately-consecrated persons, with bishop Gardener and bishop Miller, had, in a paper subscribed by them, most presumptuously excluded the other eight bishops from any jurisdiction in this church, or having any decisive vote in the assemblies of the governors thereof: We, therefore, have thought ourselves obliged in conscience to declare, and by these presents do declare the said elections to be null and void, and their consecrations to be most irregular and uncanonical; and that the said Dr. Rattray and Mr. Dunbar are no bishops of this national church, and ought to claim no power or jurisdiction as such. Wherefore we discharge all the clergy from owning or submitting themselves to them, or giving them any obedience as bishops of this church, aye and until they shall appear before the college of bishops when cited, and give satisfaction to the lawful governors of this church; particularly by obliging themselves under their hands, not to encourage or use in the public worship *The Usages, Prayers for the Dead, &c.* which have so woefully disturbed this church, and given great scandal to most of the Reformed both here and elsewhere, and to censure all such, who may be under their jurisdiction, that make any innovations in the public worship, contrary

trary to the Formula; and appoint this to be intimated.
Given at Edinburgh, the 29th of June, 1727, and subscribed by us,

“Jo. Auchterlonie, bishop.

“Da. Ranken, bp.

“Jo. Gillan, bishop,

“Alex. Duncan, Preses.

“David Ffreebairn, bp.

“Ja. Rofs, bp.”

Nº V.

*Extract of a Letter from Bishop Rofs to Bishop Gillan,
28th December, 1731.*

“I have carefully perused the articles you sent me, which, I think (with some little amendments, which I told to our brother [Auchterlonie] the bearer) may pass in so far as the church is concerned: but you say nothing in relation to our friend abroad; which, I am sure, considering what has passed under our hands, neither Mr. Freebairn nor you have neglected; and therefore I think your silence upon that point must be the effect of prudence, lest your letter should have miscarried. This is a thing you know none of us can pass from; and for my own part, I never will.”

Extracts

Extraels from a Letter of Bishop Auchterlonie to Bishop Dunbar; from an original Copy preserved by the former.

“ You cannot but know, that, upon the seeming agreement among the bishops in the year 1731, it was stipulated, that the bishops Freebairn, Duncan, Ross, Gillan, Ranken, and I, should acquaint a certain person of what had happened, and supplicate him to consent to your and their being received by us as bishops of the Church of Scotland; to which he returned answer in the following words, which I just now copy from the original, which lies before me, *I am glad of the happy union that now subsists among you, &c.*

This I supposed ye may not have heard of, and therefore have taken the freedom to lay before you now. How far his just expectations have been disappointed is too notorious to all the nation, by several overt acts done by you and your brethren in contempt of and opposition to the right of this person, when his affairs are low, and he in no present capacity to assert his right.”—“ It is for this that I have for some years past fallen under the ill-will of my brethren; although they have not dared openly to own it, yet it is evident, that this is the chief if not the only point upon which our very unhappy divisions subsist,—and are like to do, while it pleases God to continue me in this world, which cannot by the course of nature be long, having already completed the seventy-fourth year of my age.”—“ It is indeed my misfortune to be left alone, and singled as the speckled bird by my brethren; but, so long as I am conscious to myself to have done nothing but what I am bound in duty to do, it makes me easie under misfortune.”

No date ; but in reply to one of the 28th of November, 1741.

Nº VI.

Extract of a Letter from Bishop Gillan to Bishop Auchterlonie, of 22d February, 1731.

“ The first article is, That divine service shall be performed by the Scottish and English liturgies, and that the peace of the church shall not be disturbed by introducing into the public-worship any of the usages ; and that whosoever acts otherwise shall be censured.”

The other articles, according to him, were on the election and consecration of bishops, and on the rule of their precedence.

F I N I S.

*Lately published by J. PRIDDEN, N^o 100,
Fleet-street.*

I. Debates in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, on taking into Consideration an Overture from Jedburgh respecting the Test Act, May 27, 1790. To which is added a Speech of Lord Lansdown, on Occasional Conformity. Price 1s.

II. Observations on the Conduct of the Protestant Dissenters. Price 6d.

III. A Second Part of the Observations on the Conduct of the Protestant Dissenters. Price 6d.

IV. Episcopal Opinions on the Test and Corporation Acts; delivered in the House of Peers, in 1718, by Archbishop Wake, Archbishop Dawes, Bishop Hoadly, Bishop Smalridge, Bishop Willis, Bishop Gibson, Bishop Robinson, Bishop Atterbury, and Bishop Gastrell. With Arguments, on the same Occasion, by the Duke of Buckingham, Earl Stanhope, the Earl of Nottingham, the Earl of Sunderland, the Earl of Ilay, Lord Viscount Townshend, Lord North and Grey, Lord Coningsby, and Lord Lansdown. Price 1s.

“ I am very glad that my Friends have been so firm in pressing the TEST;
“ which is the great Barrier against POPERY and the PRESBYTERIANS.”
Duke of ORMOND, in 1709.

